

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-7 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the Amendments and Remarks as set forth below.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 1 due to the term "certain elastic force". By way of the present amendment, Applicants have removed this term and instead now use the term "to provide an elastic force". Thus, this objection is overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Lary (U.S. Patent 5,911,494). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner states that Lary shows a light emitter with a cap having a removable Halide light with a casing 11, a switch 25, a plurality of lamps 34, a battery 26, a clip 16, 21 located in the upper portion of the housing and is attached to a leisure cap. Applicants submit that the claims as presently amended are not anticipated by this reference.

Applicants note that the Lary reference shows that the light is attached to the hat using velcro strips. This differs from the present invention where the device is installed using a clip on one side of the housing. The Examiner has referred to a clip which holds the battery in place inside the housing. Applicants submit that the arrangement of the clip in the present invention is completely different.

Claim 1 has now been amended to make it clear that the clip is provided on an outer surface of the casing. Also, the clip is engaged with an object by having a clip on one side and a casing on the other side. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by the Lary reference. Likewise, none of the other references show such a clip on an upper outer surface of the casing. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

A number of dependent claims have also been added in order to further describe the present invention. Claim 2 describes the object as a hat. Claim 3 further describes the hat as a leisure cap and claim 4 indicates that the light is attached to the visor of the cap. Claim 5 points out that the light is pushed onto the visor of the cap and pulled to remove it. Claim 6 points out that the range of the light is the same as the view angle of the person wearing the hat. Claim 7 describes that the clip is deformed in order to receive the object between the clip and the casing. Applicants submit that these limitations also are not seen in the references and accordingly, these claims are additionally allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: NOV 9 2005 -

Respectfully submitted,

By *Esther H. Chong #40,953*
James T. Eller, Jr.

JE Registration No.: 39,538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant